

# THE REMONSTRANCE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1916

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,  
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

## Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-one Branch Committees: 37,467\*  
members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President  
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ  
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY } Vice  
MRS. ANNA L. DAVES } Presidents  
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD  
MRS. FRANCIS G. LOWELL  
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY  
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer  
Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee  
Chairman

MRS. WM. LOWELL PUTNAM

Publicity Committee

Chairman

MRS. A. H. PARKER

Membership Committee

Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Public Interest League

President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

Recording Secretary

MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM

Corresponding Secretary

MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD

\* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

## SUFFRAGE AND THE PLATFORMS

THE suffragists are exultant over the fact that the Republican, Democratic, Prohibition and Socialist national conventions adopted platforms favorable to suffrage.

They would like to believe and would like to have the public believe that this means that the conventions expressed the views of their constituencies upon the question. But the absurdity of this assumption is apparent upon the face of it. If it were true, it would mean that the sentiment of the electorate, throughout the country, is practically unanimous for suffrage. No one knows better

than the suffrage leaders that this is far enough from being the case.

There are three ways in which the sentiment of the country may be tested with reasonable accuracy: through the action of Congress; through the action of the legislatures; and through the direct vote of the electors at the polls. Tested by either of these, the suffrage cause is losing rather than gaining ground. As to Congress, the suffragists know that they cannot get as many votes there as when the question last came up. It was for this reason that, at the very time when they were professing great indignation because the Anthony amendment was not brought to a vote, they were entreating the chairman of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage not to allow it to come up. As to the legislatures, the New York legislature is the only one which has yielded to the suffrage demands this year; and there is not the slightest reason to believe that the electorate which rejected woman suffrage by a majority of nearly 200,000 last November has changed its mind. On the contrary, the probability is that the anti-suffrage majority, as was the case in Ohio and Michigan, will be greatly increased if the question is again submitted. As to the attitude of the electorate, during the last eleven months the issue has been brought directly before the voters in five states, and suffrage has been defeated in all of them. These five states, by the way, have a combined population more than three times as large as the combined population of the eleven double suffrage states.

Bearing these facts in mind, what is the real significance of the suffrage declarations in the political platforms? Party platforms serve two uses. They define actual party principles; and they are also framed

with a view to attracting votes so far as may be possible without actually sacrificing those principles. The single-term plank in the national Democratic platform of 1912 is a case in point. As the candidate of the Republican party was running for a second term, the single-term Democratic plank was looked upon as good strategy. It served its purpose; but it did not influence in the least the action of the party four years later.

So, as to the suffrage planks this year. The conventions of the two great parties were attacked by the Congressional Union, which insisted that it represented four million women voters and was able to deliver 91 electoral votes to the party which would do what it wanted done. The shrewd politicians who framed the platforms knew that the claim was groundless. They were aware, probably, that Mrs. Catt, president of the older, less flighty and less truculent suffrage organization, admitted that there are less than two million women voters. As to the claim that these voters could be withdrawn from their ordinary party allegiance, and wielded solidly as a menace on the suffrage question, they knew that the attempt of the Congressional Union in that direction failed miserably at the last Congressional election; and that the attempt of the National Woman Suffrage Association to boycott individual Congressmen for the same reason also failed utterly.

The platform makers therefore followed the line of least resistance. They would not and did not concede what the Congressional Union demanded—an endorsement of the proposed suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution. But they inserted a general expression of sympathy, and then left the question to the states.



The thing that really counts in these platform declarations is that the two great parties, by agreeing upon practically the same statement upon this question, eliminated the issue. The crusade of the Congressional Union failed; and the policy which seeks to override the voters, and to make suffrage states of meagre population the equals of the states of great population in the ultimate decision was given no encouragement.

#### HOW THEY RESPONDED

THE Suffragist has published an ecstatic article summarizing the results of the Congressional Union crusade against Democratic candidates for Congress in the suffrage states in 1914. It states that the Congressional Union "went out into every one of the suffrage states and asked the women these questions: Do you know that your representatives are putting party loyalty ahead of women's freedom? Do you wish to use your votes to keep in power a party that blocks the way of other women?" "It was a difficult appeal," the article goes on to say, "this first one to the women. They were asked suddenly to give up all their 'local loyalties,' to catch the broad national vision, to sacrifice the immediate and personal for a future gain that would be only in small part theirs. Yet so splendidly did they respond that only nineteen of the forty-three candidates campaigned against sat in the next Congress."

The reader is intended to infer that, owing to the "splendid response" of the Democratic women of the suffrage states to the appeals of the Congressional Union, twenty-four Democratic candidates for Congress were defeated, and only nineteen escaped the slaughter.

Would any one guess, from The Suffragist's narrative, that the defeated Democratic candidates were running in hopelessly Republican districts, already represented by Republicans, and that the net result of the

*Congressional Union crusade was actually to increase instead of diminishing the Democratic representation from the suffrage states?*

Yet that is the fact. In the House, in the 63d Congress, there were 15 Democratic representatives from the suffrage states:—one from Arizona, three from California, four from Colorado, five from Kansas, and two from Montana. In the House, in the present Congress, after the Congressional Union crusade and the "splendid response" of the Democratic women, there are *seventeen Democratic representatives from the suffrage states*,—one from Arizona, three from California, three from Colorado, six from Kansas, two from Montana, one from Utah and one from Washington. As to the Senate, there were four Democratic Senators who were candidates for re-election in the suffrage states,—Smith of Arizona, Thomas of Colorado, Newlands of Nevada and Chamberlain of Oregon. *Every one of them was re-elected*, in spite of the suffrage "drive" against them. Nor was this all; but in California, Senator Perkins, Republican, was displaced by Senator Phelan, Democrat.

The Congressional Union attack upon Democratic candidates in the suffrage states, therefore, so far from injuring the Democratic party, resulted in a Democratic gain of two Representatives and one Senator.

These are facts that cannot be disputed, however it may please the Congressional Union to ignore or misrepresent them. They show that the Congressional Union attempt to persuade the Democratic women in the suffrage states to "catch the broad national vision" and to abandon their party allegiance because a Democratic Congress had not passed a suffrage amendment was a gloomy failure. There is no reason to believe that these women will take any more kindly to the appeal this year than two years ago.

Incidentally, the reckless mendacity of The Suffragist article is a fresh il-

lustration of the lengths to which the suffragist leaders are willing to go in their attempts to mislead the public. Such statements as those quoted cannot possibly have been made through ignorance. They are deliberate mis-statements, put forward in the hope that no one would take the trouble to expose them.

#### A WORD OF WARNING

THE suffragists are busy soliciting pledges from candidates for Congress to vote for the Anthony suffrage amendment.

Democratic candidates who are thus approached should remember that their national convention has declared that any extension of the franchise to women should be "*State by State*." That is a plain declaration against the Anthony amendment.

Republican candidates who are asked to give this pledge should read the Republican national platform, which declares that the Republican party "*recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself*." That also is a plain declaration against the Anthony amendment.

Candidates of either party from New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Iowa, North and South Dakota, Missouri or Oklahoma should bear in mind the fact that the voters of all those states, within the last six years, have defeated woman suffrage at the polls, and are likely to view with some impatience candidates for Congress who pledge themselves to *misrepresent their constituents* on this issue.

IF, as the suffragists insist, the low infantile death-rate in New Zealand is to be credited to woman suffrage, what shall be said of the high and steadily increasing illegitimate birth-rate in that colony? This stood at 33 per 1,000 births in the year before women were given the ballot; it jumped to 37 the next year, and has risen steadily until now it is 46.



**THE "FOUR MILLION" MYTH**

THE Congressional Union and the so-called "Woman's Party" go right on claiming to represent and to control 4,000,000 women voters, although they know perfectly well that there are not four million women voters or anything like that number in the suffrage states.

Let us see what the facts are. Of the twelve states in which women will vote for President next month, there are nine in which women voted for United States Senator or for Governor in 1914. In these nine states, the total vote cast, men and women, was 2,636,796. In these states, there are, on the average, 135.9 males to 100 females. Applying this ratio of sex in the population to the total vote, and assuming that as large a proportion of women of voting age voted as men, which is certainly a generous assumption, we have 1,117,286 women voters in the nine states.

This leaves, in round numbers, 2,900,000 women voters to be found in the three states—Illinois, Montana and Nevada—in which women will vote for President for the first time next month. *But the total female population of those states, from babies in arms up, is only 2,905,422.* The suffragists are in the habit of counting in young children to swell the membership of their Associations. Is the Woman's Party carrying forward that process into its computation of the women voters?

So high a suffrage authority as Mrs. Catt, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, admits that the total number of women voters in the twelve states is less than two million. This is what she said, at the Congressional Conference of the Woman Suffrage Party in New York, last February:

*"There never were four million voters in the western suffrage states. The total number of women is only 3,700,000. Two-thirds of the men are eligible to vote, and it is only proper to suppose that the same pro-*

*portion holds true of women. That makes about 2,300,000 on the voting list, and only 80 per cent. of these can be counted on to go to the polls and vote. That brings the four million down to less than two.*

**PAYING THE COST**

Dr. Arabella Kenealy, writing in the London Mail, directs attention to the fact that, when women attempt to do men's work, physically laborious and mentally exacting, they pay the cost, and that a part of the cost comes out of the next generation. Dr. Kenealy traces a direct connection between the increased number of women employed in men's occupations and "the grave and increasing constitutional delicacy, feeble-mindedness, disease and high mortality rate of infants and children" which doctors deplore. She affirms that when women are trained to compete physically, professionally and industrially with men, the natural investment in them of vital power for racial purposes is prevented, and the race suffers proportionally. She adds:

*"By force of brain or will we may increase our physical and mental output—but only at the cost of constitution. And this is what our girls and women have been doing for some generations, and what in their admirable efforts to take men's places they are doing still more now. And the consequences? The consequences are disastrous to the children. Because the mothers, in overdrawing on their constitutional reserves to enable them to do men's work, exhaust the constitutional resources of the generations to come."*

England is justly proud of the part which its women are playing in the present war, in filling, so far as they can, the places of the men who have gone to the front; but, as Dr. Kenealy says, there are abundant reasons for wishing the abnormal conditions to come to an end as soon as possible, and for taking care that women's work should not be exploited, either for the benefit of employers or for propaganda pur-

poses, and that the dangers to which they are exposed should be reduced to a minimum.

Statesmen and statisticians are estimating the financial burden which later generations will have to carry by reason of the great war. But a far heavier and more deplorable burden is that which Dr. Kenealy indicates—an enfeebled womanhood, and generations of children doomed to short and sickly lives.

**NOT AFRAID**

SENATOR KEY PITTMAN of Nevada is an ardent suffragist and comes from a suffrage state. He is, moreover, a candidate for re-election at the approaching election. But he is apparently not afraid of the threats of the Congressional Union and the so-called Woman's Party, for he told some plain truths in an address which he made to Democratic women at Washington last July.

As reported in *The Suffragist*, he declared that even if the Democratic party put a Federal amendment through Congress, it could not possibly be ratified. He said:

*"The needless rushing ahead of the times in pushing this matter upon unwilling people shows a lack of wisdom. The real difficulty at present is the indifference of women. When men begin to consider the problem of woman suffrage favorably, they find that their wives are 'not interested.' Your first duty should be to convert women, who will in turn convert men."*

*"If I were the most ardent enemy of woman suffrage,"* Senator Pittman went on to say, *"I would make it a point to vote for the Susan B. Anthony amendment, because I know it would hurt the cause."*

Considering the source from which it comes, that is a warning which the suffragists would do well to lay to heart.

**CHICAGO WOMEN VOTERS**

(From *The Boston Globe*, Sept. 16, 1916)

FEWER than 14 in every 100 of the registered women voters of Chicago voted Wednesday in the primaries, and yet it was not bargain day.



### WHY IOWA DEFEATED SUFFRAGE

THE official account of the defeat of woman suffrage in Iowa, given in *The Woman's Journal* by Miss Flora Dunlap, President of the Iowa Equal Suffrage Association, is interesting by reason of its incidental admissions.

There is, of course, the familiar but unfounded claim that it was the "commercialized liquor interests and all the evil forces of the State" that did it; but the early claim of fraud in the election is frankly abandoned. Miss Dunlap says: "In no place was evidence found of deliberate fraud or of sufficient irregularities to change the result."

Miss Dunlap admits that the result of the vote was "a great disappointment to Iowa suffragists." They felt that Iowa was "so progressive a State that woman suffrage would carry in the first referendum." They had the support of five-sixths of the newspapers; they distributed five million pieces of literature; every one of the ninety-nine counties in the State was organized, and twenty counties had paid secretaries; generous help in money and workers was given by other state suffrage associations and by the National Association; forty men's leagues co-operated with the suffragists; and the whole state was covered in the speaking campaign.

And yet, in spite of all this, the amendment was defeated. Why? Miss Dunlap says: "*Not enough women in Iowa worked; not enough gave money.*" And she adds sorrowfully: "*Until many more men and women in Iowa who believe in Democracy and in justice recognize that this is not a woman's fight but a human fight, and join in the ranks of working suffragists, Iowa will be a black spot on the suffrage map.*"

In other words, suffrage was beaten in Iowa because a majority of the women did not want it. If they had wanted it, they would have worked for it and given money for it. And, because they did not want it, a majority of the men of the State,

ascertaining their wishes and understanding their feeling, voted against it.

All that anti-suffragists ask, in any State where this question is pending, is that the men shall ask the women what they want, and vote accordingly. If the men of South Dakota and West Virginia do this, as the men of Iowa evidently did, there will be no doubt as to their vote next month.

### A HOPELESS ENTERPRISE

THE suffragists hold over Congress, as a club, the voting strength of the double-suffrage states; and they boast that they represent one-fourth of the Senate, and one-sixth of the House.

But it is a long way from one-fourth in the one and one-sixth in the other to two-thirds in both, which must be secured before an amendment can gain the sanction of Congress. Moreover, as to the House, the suffragists, as usual, exaggerate their strength. The eleven double-suffrage states do not elect one-sixth but less than one-tenth of the membership of the House. On the other hand, the thirteen male-suffrage states which, since 1910, have rejected woman suffrage, elect 43 per cent. of the membership. Add to these the Southern States, which stand resolutely for state rights, and the other states in which the suffragists have not been able even to induce the legislatures to submit the question to the voters, and it will be seen how hopeless are the suffragist prospects in Congress.

But suppose—which is practically impossible—that Congress should act favorably on the suffrage amendment. What would be its prospects in the states? To win, the suffragists would have to add twenty-five states to the eleven which they now have. But, to defeat the amendment and to postpone suffrage indefinitely, all that would be necessary would be the opposition of thirteen states. The thirteen states which have rejected suffrage at the polls within the last six

years would be enough in themselves to achieve this result.

If the suffrage leaders were able to break down the state rights sentiment in the Southern States, and to carry every Southern State and every other state where the question has not been submitted to the people, they would still fail of their purpose. The more sagacious of them must understand this perfectly. Their "drive" at Congress is not prompted by any hope of success, but by a desire to keep the movement alive.

THE annual summary of labor legislation in the United States, published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, shows a considerable advance in state legislation in 1915 for the protection of women and children. But one searches it in vain for any evidence that the suffrage states are doing any more in this direction than the male suffrage states. The Kansas legislature enacted a minimum wage law; but the Arkansas legislature did the same; and the most noteworthy progress in child labor legislation was in two male suffrage states, Arkansas and Pennsylvania.

### THE NEXT THING

Anti-suffragists should make it their first duty, during the remaining weeks of the national campaign, to dissuade candidates for Congress from promising support to the Federal suffrage amendment.

By letter, by personal appeals, and by arranging interviews at which delegations may be heard, they should reach every candidate and urge him to stand by the enormous majority of women who do not wish to have the ballot thrust upon them; and to carry out the expressed wishes of the 295,939 Massachusetts voters who buried the proposed state amendment at the polls last year by the heaviest majority ever recorded.

This work should be entered upon at once and continued until election day.



## WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN

THE politicians will do well to consider what might happen if the Presidential election next month were to be so close that the result depended upon the electoral vote of Illinois.

The Constitution of Illinois expressly restricts the suffrage to "male citizens of the United States, above the age of 21 years." In spite of this provision, the Legislature of 1913 ventured to add to a bill giving women the right to vote for municipal and other offices created by the Legislature a provision entitling them to vote for Presidential electors.

So much of this bill as related to municipal offices was sustained by the Illinois Supreme Court in 1913 by a decision in which four justices concurred and three disagreed. *But the right of a Legislature to override, so far as the choice of Presidential electors is concerned, the express provision of the state constitution limiting the suffrage to male citizens has never been brought under review by the courts, in Illinois or in any other State.*

It will be remembered that, in the case which came before the Illinois Supreme Court, last summer, involving the interpretation of the limited-suffrage bill,—the Macomb case, described in the July REMONSTRANCE—the decision of the Court, which was adverse to the suffragists, was given also by a vote of four to three. The court is not now constituted as it was in 1913. Six of the judges are the same, and they aligned themselves in the Macomb case as they had done in the earlier decision. But the seventh judge is a new member of the Court, and it was his vote which decided the case against the suffragists.

It will be remembered also that, when the Illinois Supreme Court last February decided adversely upon the suffragist claim to a right to vote for delegates to national conventions, Mrs. Helen Stewart, 2d vice-president of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, writing in *The Woman's Journal* of February 26, said: "*We*

*did not feel it at all wise to allow the matter of our whole bill to be brought up before the Supreme Court, even for the sake of voting for the important offices that were in question at this time.*"

That declaration shows plainly that the Illinois suffragists are so uncertain of the validity of the Act of 1913 that they dare not venture to have it submitted to the courts.

But, whatever the apprehensions of the suffragists, the validity of that Act will have to be submitted to the courts, if Illinois should happen to be the pivotal state in next month's Presidential election. The twenty-nine electoral votes of Illinois will then be in the balance, turning the national result this way or that, according as it is decided whether the women who helped to choose the electors had or had not the right to vote.

This is a contingency sufficiently serious to give the politicians something to think about.

## THE COLLEGE ANTI-SUFFRAGE LEAGUE

MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, the organizing chairman of the College Anti-Suffrage League reports widespread interest and enthusiasm among the members. Influential college women of the State have manifested much zeal in the work. Since the initial meeting in May, the membership has grown steadily and now numbers several hundred.

The League will secure hearings before alumnae associations and before undergraduates to acquaint them with anti-suffragist principles and aims, and the scope of the educational work of the state and national anti-suffrage associations. The first League meeting to complete organization and to elect officers will be held at the home of Mrs. Allen, in Boston, early in November. Already meetings have been arranged for during that month before the Radcliffe Civics Club, and at Wellesley College. It is expected that Miss Marjorie Dorman, the well-

known anti-suffrage speaker, who is now studying law at Columbia University, will address these meetings. Hearings have also been secured for Mt. Holyoke and Tufts, the dates for which will be announced later.

The personnel of the advisory board is: Miss Harriet E. Johnson (Boston University); Mrs. Herbert Lyman and Mrs. Talbot Aldrich (Bryn Mawr); Mrs. Frank Merriman and Miss Alice L. Robinson (Mt. Holyoke); Miss Elizabeth Jackson and Miss Helen C. McCleary (Radcliffe); Mrs. F. H. Daniels, Mrs. George C. Colt, Mrs. A. S. Apsey and Mrs. Frank Pemberton (Smith); Mrs. G. T. Francis and Miss F. Josephine Baker (Simmons); Mrs. C. H. Woodbury (Tufts); Miss Christel Wilkins and Mrs. Edward Kinsley (Vassar); Mrs. Ellis Spear, Jr., Mrs. A. J. George and Mrs. Herbert Magoun (Wellesley); Miss Adelaide Proctor and Mrs. William A. Drew (Wheaton); and Mrs. C. P. Strong (M. I. T., Women's Department).

## WHAT ONE SUFFRAGE SENATOR THINKS

"I AM now, as I have been at all times, firmly opposed to the proposed national amendment providing for woman suffrage. . . . I never, at any time, directly or indirectly, gave any support to the Anthony amendment. I am utterly and uncompromisingly opposed to imposing suffrage upon any State until the majority of the voters of that State have signified their willingness to take it, and I want that action to be by the separate action of each State."—*Senator William E. Borah of Idaho.*

## HELP FOR THE CAMPAIGN STATES

Massachusetts anti-suffragists can at the present moment render no better aid to the cause than by sending contributions of money to aid the anti-suffragists of South Dakota and West Virginia to defeat the suffrage amendments which are to be voted on next month. Money is needed in both states for literature, public meetings, speakers and other campaign expenses.

Contributions for these purposes will be forwarded promptly if sent to Mrs. James M. Codman, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.



**THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT**

The suffragists make a curious tactical error in citing the Fifteenth Amendment as a precedent for their attempt to secure woman suffrage through an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Apparently they have forgotten the circumstances under which the Fifteenth Amendment was approved by Congress and ratified by the States. That amendment and the two that preceded it were the outcome of the Civil War and were regarded as needed in order to secure its results. As Mr. Bryce says, in his history of *The American Commonwealth*: "The requisite majority of States was obtained under conditions altogether abnormal, some of the lately conquered states ratifying while actually controlled by the northern armies, others as the price which they were compelled to pay for the readmission to Congress of their senators and representatives. . . . These deep-reaching changes were carried through not by the free will of the peoples of three-fourths of the states, but under the pressure of a majority which had triumphed in a great war, and used its command of the military strength and Federal government of the Union to effect purposes deemed indispensable to the reconstruction of the Federal system." Upon three of the southern states—Virginia, Mississippi and Texas—Congress imposed the special condition that they must ratify the Fifteenth Amendment before military government was withdrawn and they were restored to their full positions in the Union. The scope and purpose of the Fifteenth Amendment were well defined by the late Senator Ingalls of Kansas in the chapter which he contributed to John D. Long's history of *The Republican Party*. Mr. Ingalls said:

"The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution does not, as is sometimes supposed, grant the right of suffrage to any one. It only exempts citizens of the United States from discrimination in the several states in the

exercise of the right to vote on account of "race, color or previous condition of servitude," and empowers Congress to enforce that right of exemption by appropriate legislation. The power of the states to qualify or deny the elective franchise upon other grounds, such as nativity, sex, illiteracy, non-payment of taxes, remains unchanged. The authority of Congress to legislate at all upon the subject of suffrage in the different States rests alone upon the Fifteenth Amendment. It can be exercised only by providing punishment when the votes of the qualified electors at any State or National election are refused by the State authorities, on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude, and the only punishment that can be inflicted upon the State is the reduction of its representation in Congress and the Electoral College."

There is no parallel between the conditions which led up to the Fifteenth Amendment, as the final act in the war and reconstruction period, and those now existing. It would be the height of the ridiculous to claim that the little handful of sparsely-settled suffrage States has or should have the power to force woman suffrage upon more important and populous States which, after full consideration, have rejected suffrage by an overwhelming majority of their voters.

The conditions of suffrage remain a matter for the States to deal with separately; and we may rest assured that, unless in some unthinkable period of stress, like that of the war and reconstruction years, Congress will not meddle with them.

**A "DRIVE" THAT FAILED**

All that *THE REMONSTRANCE* has said of the complete failure of the "drive" of the Congressional Union against Democratic Congressional candidates at the last election, because of the refusal of the Democratic party to support the Anthony amendment, is fully corroborated by Senator Thomas of Colorado.

Mr. Thomas is a life-long suffragist, represents a suffrage State, and is chairman of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage; but the Con-

gressional Union marked him for slaughter notwithstanding. What came of this suffrage "drive" Mr. Thomas explained in a speech in the Senate on the 5th of July. He said:

"Its only effect was to arouse the antagonism of the Democratic women and to bring them to the polls in far greater numbers than would otherwise have been the case; and in that respect it was a great benefit to some of the successful candidates, myself among the number; but that action has left, and very naturally so, a spirit of antagonism in the ranks of Democratic women, the seeds of which were then sowed very actively in the Commonwealth, and I am satisfied that that is the case in every one of the States where this movement was carried on. . . . I think it is perfectly appropriate that I should assert that the control of the 4,000,000 women voters of this country by any organization is a wholly unwarranted and unfounded assumption. It controls neither 4,000,000 nor 3,000,000 nor 2,000,000 nor 1,000,000 nor 250,000 of them."

**NOT A PROSPEROUS YEAR**

THE suffragists do well to make all the capital they can out of the action of the New York legislature in voting favorably upon the proposal to resubmit the suffrage amendment; for that, from the suffrage point of view, is the one bright spot in the record of the year 1916.

The defeat of the suffrage amendment at the polls in Iowa in June was a bitter disappointment to the suffragists, as their leaders confess. The failure to bring the Anthony amendment to a vote in Congress is not less humiliating because it was largely due to the conviction of the suffrage leaders that they would make a poorer showing than before.

As to the legislatures, proposed suffrage amendments were defeated in Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana and Georgia; in Rhode Island, a presidential suffrage bill was killed in committee; and in New Jersey, the adverse report of the committee on a similar bill was accepted.



### NOT HUMBUG BUT COMMON SENSE

THE Woman's Journal describes it as "a piece of humbug" that anti-suffragists should oppose the Federal suffrage amendment on the ground that it deprives the people of a chance to vote on it, while, when the question is before legislatures, they oppose favorable action which would send it to the people.

The Woman's Journal, as is its habit, is merely playing with words. There is no real resemblance between the two things. There is not the slightest inconsistency in the anti-suffrage attitude toward them.

The framers of our state constitutions wisely guarded against precipitate and capricious changes. In Massachusetts, for example, a proposed amendment to the Constitution must be first approved by a majority of the Senators and two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives in one Legislature; must next be approved by a majority of the Senators and two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives in the succeeding Legislature; and, finally, must be ratified by a majority of the qualified voters of the State, before it becomes a part of the Constitution.

Here are three stages through which a proposed amendment must pass. The provisions are intended to secure discussion and deliberate action. The required approval of two Legislatures is no mere form. It is not intended that legislators shall give a good-humored approval to any proposition which may come before them, waiving their own responsibility. It is for them to vote on any proposition according to their best judgment of what is right and wise. Surely, the opponents of any proposed amendment are justified in opposing it at all three of the stages established by the Constitution.

There are two radical differences between this process and that proposed by the Anthony amendment. The suffragists are pushing that amendment openly on the ground that

it gives them a chance altogether to avoid any submission of the question to the voters. They are pushing it also, because, in the determination of the final result, it gives to such States as Nevada and Wyoming, with populations of only 81,875 and 145,965 respectively, equal weight with New York, with more than 9,000,000, and Pennsylvania, with more than 7,000,000.

It is the suffragists, not the anti-suffragists, who are inconsistent. They profess to stand for a larger Democracy; yet they are concentrating all their strength upon a proposal which would allow the minority to override the majority, and would practically disfranchise the voters upon a revolutionary and nation-wide change in the electorate.

THE Woman's Journal devotes several columns to a recital of evidence of political corruption in Colorado, through corporation influence; but it insists that woman suffrage had nothing to do with it. If these conditions existed in a male suffrage state, would not The Woman's Journal charge them up against the men, and urge woman suffrage as an infallible cure?

### NOT AN ISSUE

(From the Boston Herald, July 11, 1916.)

SUFFRAGE is not an issue in the coming Presidential election, and any attempt to drag it in or to make party capital out of it deserves discouragement at the start. The two platforms have suffrage planks that are alike in their most important feature—they say little and mean less. Suffrage has been and will remain a state problem, not a national problem or a party issue—unless Congress proposes to amend the national constitution. It is possible, though hardly probable at present, that two-thirds (three-fourths—Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE) would ratify a suffrage amendment to the constitution. It is far less probable that two-thirds of both branches of Congress will in the immediate future submit such an amendment, no matter which party has a majority there.

THE Woman's Journal has at last reached the conclusion that "Any suffragist who is guilty of rudeness in public hurts the cause." Miss Margaret Foley and the other professional suffrage hecklers will read this declaration with interest.

A RECENT number of the Woman's Journal mentions Senator Borah of Idaho among prominent men "who have come out for suffrage." The quotation from Senator Borah, published in another column, shows how the Idaho Senator has "come out" on the question of the Federal amendment.

### A STRANGE COMMENTARY

(From the Cincinnati Times-Star, Aug 2, 1916.)

WITHIN the past year or two many of the greatest states of the Union, by popular vote, have declared that they do not want woman suffrage. . . . It would be a strange commentary on our present-day devotion to direct popular rule for these great states to have suffrage rammed down their throats by the Legislatures of sparsely-populated states like Montana, Nevada and Wyoming.

### A SEX WAR

(From the New York Times, July 14, 1916.)

So far as the Woman's Party proves its power, so far it will justify even the most extravagant arguments against woman suffrage. Even the argument that it would set one sex against another, bring about a war of sex against sex, in which few opponents of woman suffrage ever really believed, is now being invested with as much probability as the Woman's Party can give it. Its members threaten the candidates with the votes of a sex. Doubtless they cannot make good that threat entirely; but the greater the strength they develop, the nearer they bring that apparently wild charge to demonstrated truth. So far as they can, they are bringing to bear the influence of a sex for political blackmail. So far as they can, they are demonstrating the charge that woman suffrage will make in politics a division along sex lines.



**SUFFRAGE DUPLICITY**

READERS of THE REMONSTRANCE will remember that, on the Fourth of July, when President Wilson was making an address at the dedication of the American Federation of Labor Building at Washington, he was interrupted repeatedly by a representative of the Congressional Union, who demanded to know why he had blocked the suffrage movement. The young woman who continued this heckling until she was checked by the police was accompanied by Miss Alice Paul, President of the Union, and by other officers of the Union, showing that the interruption of the President had been officially planned.

On the 30th of June—just four days previous to this demonstration—Miss Anne H. Martin, Legislative Chairman of the Congressional Union, had addressed the following letter to Senator Thomas, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage:

"We understand that a meeting of Senators from the suffrage States has been held, and that there has been some discussion of bringing the national suffrage amendment to a vote at an early date. The amendment is known as Senate joint resolution No. 1, and is Order No. 27 on the Senate calendar.

*The Congressional Union is not yet ready for a vote on this amendment, and we write to ask you to oppose any effort which may be made for an early vote. We earnestly request that no move at all be made for a vote in the Senate without consultation with the Congressional Union on this subject.*"

Here is a fresh and striking illustration of suffrage duplicity. At the very moment when the Congressional Union was officially heckling the President for "blocking" the suffrage amendment, it was officially doing its utmost to block a vote on the amendment. And this for the reason, as stated by Senator Thomas, that an informal poll of the Senate had shown that the number of Sen-

ators favoring the amendment was considerably less than the number of votes cast for the same amendment in the last Congress.

Incidentally, this shows that the suffrage cause is losing ground in Congress as well as in the country at large; and anti-suffragists cannot too strongly express their appreciation of the work which the Congressional Union has unwittingly done to produce this result. As Senator Thomas said, in his speech in the Senate on the 5th of July: "If the propaganda, the campaign which has recently characterized the Congressional Union, is continued, it will, as it ought, drive supporters away from the cause of woman suffrage instead of attracting them to it."

**THE SUFFRAGE FACTIONS**

The breach between the suffrage factions has been widened by the action taken by the conference of the so-called "Woman's Party" at Colorado Springs in August, and the convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association at Atlantic City in September.

The "Woman's Party," which is the Congressional Union under another name, pledged itself "to use its best efforts in the twelve states where women vote for President to defeat the Democratic candidate for President; and in the eleven states where women vote for members of Congress to defeat the candidates of the Democratic party for Congress."

The National Association defeated a resolution providing that the Association support for national office only those who supported the Susan B. Anthony amendment; and adopted a platform expressing its purpose to continue its campaign in support of the Federal amendment, and to maintain a lobby at Washington for that purpose. It also provided for assistance in state campaigns, but warned state Associations which undertake such campaigns without first obtaining the consent of the National Board that they must finance their campaigns

without help from the National Association. The convention changed its constitution so as to bar from membership all organizations not in harmony with its policy and constitution; but provided that any state organizations not desiring to work for the Federal amendment may remain members of the National Association, provided they do not work against that amendment.

The net result is that the "Woman's Party" is pledged to war against the Democratic party and its candidates in the suffrage states; while the National Association maintains an attitude of non-partisanship. Within the suffrage states, therefore, the two factions will be arrayed against each other; and the attempted crusade of the Congressional Union, which was foredoomed to failure in any case, since the men and women of the suffrage states are not to be detached from party affiliations this year, any more than two years ago, by a side issue, will be absurdly unimportant in its results.

**AN AUTHORITATIVE REBUKE**

The lesson of the fast-accumulating suffrage defeats in state campaigns seems not to have been wholly lost upon suffrage leaders. At the secret session of the executive council of the National Association at Atlantic City, Mrs. Catt, the national President, spoke quite plainly. Ida Husted Harper, describing the incident, says:

"It is not violating the ethics of executive session to say that never was there so exhaustive an analysis of the situation as that presented by Mrs. Catt to the executive council yesterday afternoon. The weak spots were laid bare without mercy and the states were scored without mercy for precipitating campaigns when they had neither money nor organization. They were flayed for the narrow sectionalism which refused aid from other states and even from the national association and resulted in a defeat which reacted on the movement throughout the whole country."

It is a pity that Mrs. Catt's statement could not be published in full. It would throw light on the inner history of some recent suffrage demonstrations.